

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of April 17, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

Applicant also wishes to thank the examiner for the courtesy extended to the undersigned and his German representatives on May 23, 2007 at the USPTO.

During the interview, as reported in the Examiner Interview Summary record, claims 10 and 14 were discussed in conjunction with Fig. 2. In essence, it was noted that the prior art does not teach a measurement in at least two of the three lines. The examiner appreciated this distinction, but asked us to tie this distinction to the flow scheme shown in Fig. 2. This has been done in claims 10 and 14. In addition new claims 34 - 40 have been added with claims 35 and 38 in independent form. These claims parallel claims 10 and 14, except that they recite measuring density (claim 35) and measuring viscosity (claim 38) rather than the volumetric or mass flow rate (claims 10 and 14). The noted distinctions are present in the new claims as well.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 10 - 40 found allowable.

Submitted herewith is a copy of the specification including the claims as filed which is a copy of same in the undersigned's file. This submission is being made in reply to the examiner's request regarding the objection to the specification.

Date: May 31, 2007

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix M. D'Amrosio
Registration No: 25,721